DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 664 SP 033 550

AUTHOR Whelan, Carol Scott; And Others
TITLE A Comprehensive Evaluation of the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (Chicago, IL, November 2, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; Models; *Pilot Projects; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Career Options Research and Development; Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This publication provides evaluative information to decision makers at the state and local levels to assist in making judgments about the extent to which the goals of the Model Career Options Program (MCOP) were attained. The MCOP goals are: (1) to provide an opportunity for teachers to expand their professional horizons and explore new avenues in their roles as educators; (2) to provide teachers with meaningful career advancement; (3) to provide salary enhancements that reflect meritorious performance and advancement; and (4) to provide school systems with additional services based on the use of teachers' talents. The evaluation focuses on three separate options: teacher-to-teacher interaction (mentoring, peer coaching, peer consultant); extended contract option (provision of enrichment and remediation); and locally initiated MCOP programs (design and implementation of either a staff development or a curriculum development program). Evaluation instruments utilized, which yielded both formative and summative results, were questionnaires, interviews, a job satisfaction instrument, and teachers' logs. A 12-item list of conclusions, a 12-item list of recommendations, and a 9-item list of references are included. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341664

A Comprehensive Evaluation of the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program

by:
Carol Scott Whelan
College of Education
USL Educational Technology Review Center
University of Southwestern LA
Box 42051
Lafayette, LA 70504

Donald L. Hoover
Independent Evaluator
4065 Edgemont Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70814

Charles Teddlie
Louisiana State University
Department of Administration and Foundational Services
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-4721

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Scott Whelan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association Annual Meeting, Nov. 2, 1991, Chicago, IL.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

S1833 S50

A Comprehensive Evaluation of the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program

The following final evaluation report was prepared by a team of evaluators who have as their employment base three separate types of institutions consisting of: an Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Southwestern Louisiana, an Associate Professor of Education Research Methodology at Louisiana State University, and an Evaluation Consultant. All three members of this team have extensive experience in conducting evaluations involving many disciplines and have had the opportunity to work cooperatively and effectively in prior evaluation endeavors. All members of the team are Louisiana Certified Level A Evaluators.

This final report follows up on the Interim Evaluation Report for the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program (Whelan, Hoover and Teddlie,1991) which was submitted in February of 1991. It includes summary reports on the focus groups, the Model Career Options Program (MCOP) teachers' logs, a report on the results of the Job Descriptive Index and recommendations for the future.

Overview of the Model Career Options Program

The MCOP is mandated by the "Children's First Act" of 1988. The purposes of MCOP as stated in LA R.S. 17:3901 are: (1) to provide an opportunity for the teachers of this program to expand their professional horizons and explore new avenues in their roles as educators; (2) to provide teachers with meaningful career advancement; (3) to provide teachers with salary enhancements that reflect meritorious performance and advancement; and (4) to provide to school systems additional services based on the use of the talent of teachers.

For the 1990-91 MCOP pilot year the following MCOP selection guidelines apply: (1) participation was on a voluntary basis and; (2) each participant must be a practicing Louisiana public school teacher with a minimum of seven years teaching experience, hold a master's degree and be trained and certified in the Louisiana Teaching Internship Program (LTIP)/Louisiana Teacher Evaluation Program (LaTEP).

In the school year 1990-91, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) pilot tested three categories of Career Options. According to LDE materials, the MCOP activities were described as follow:

Career Option One - Teacher-to-Teacher Interaction:

MCOP teachers interacted with other teachers in one of the following three ways: (1) MCOP teachers worked with new teachers in a mentor role with the intent to capitalize on the knowledge and expertise of experienced teachers to nurture, guide, assist and support teachers entering the profession. (2) The MCOP teacher worked with experienced teachers in the role of peer coach. The intent was to address the needs of experienced teachers who have specific deficiencies as reflected in the statewide evaluation instrument. (3) MCOP teachers worked with experienced teachers in the role of peer consultant. The intent was to address a broad range of teachers on a request basis. Career Option One had 47 teachers participating.

Career Option Two - Extended Contract Option:

MCOP teachers in this option provided instructional programs for students, i.e., enrichment and remediation, either for extended day, week, or school year as part of an extended contract. Activities that are conducted before or after school on Saturday or during the summer are activities that meet the requirement. The instructional activities vary in nature ranging from remediation programs to enrichment programs and from pre-school to high school. Seven were elementary programs, five were middle school and the balance were combinations of the grades overlapping elementary, middle and high schools. Sixteen school districts were eligible to participate. Career Option Two had 16 participating teachers and over 315 students receiving services.

Career Option Three - Locally Initiated MCOP Programs:

This option involved the design and implementation of either a "staff development" or "curriculum development" program within a local school district. Sixteen school districts were selected to participate in the project during this pilot year.

MCOP-3 activities were developmental efforts aimed at

specific school buildings, or district level goals that are shaped by educational expectations and incorporate the talents of the MCOP teachers. MCOP teachers acted in leadership roles as staff developers, curriculum developers and peer consultants, while maintaining their classroom responsibilities. The most common topics were critical thinking skills and the LTIP/LaTEP/STAR programs.

Option One had 47 participants, Option Two had 16 participants and Option Three had 16 participants making a total of 79 participants in all.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide information to decision makers at the state and local levels to assist them in making judgements about the extent to which the goals of the program have been attained. Information regarding potential modifications needed relative to operation and administration of the MCOP program will be provided.

Evaluation Questions

The 1990-91 evaluation of the pilot MCOP focuses on the three separate options listed above. Evaluation questions to be answered are as follows:

1. What were the kinds of additional services provided by these options during the 1990-91 school year?
2. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
3. How did principals, teachers, parents and students perceive the effectiveness of the program?
4. Were there significant differences in participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of the program depending on which of the three options was utilized?
5. How might the program be improved?

Evaluation Design

The evaluation plan involved both process (formative) and product (summative) components. Through the formative evaluation, the evaluators (1) described all of the MCOP plans; (2) categorized them by major themes; (3) described the general approaches for each

of the options; (4) analyzed the logs kept by the MCOP teachers and (5) made suggestions regarding the general approaches used by MCOP participants. The summative evaluation included the following four components: (1) a general questionnaire designed to assess the perceptions of MCOP teachers, their clients, and their principals regarding the program; (2) structured telephone interviews; (3) focus group interviews with MCOP teachers; and (4) a job satisfaction instrument. The investigators used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Bowling Green State University, 1985). The JDI has been used as measure of teacher job satisfaction in recent educational studies (i.e., Shulz and Teddlie, 1989; Schulz, Teddlie and Cleveland, 1989). It measures job satisfaction in six areas: work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, people or co-workers in general.

This instrument has satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity (Smith, Smith and Rollo, 1974; Evans, 1969). Validation of the JDI insured the homogeneity of the items and their discriminating features. Validity was assessed by a modification of the Campbell-Fiske model for determining convergent and discriminant validity using cluster or principal component analysis (Campbell and Fiske, 1959). Results of the principal component analysis indicated that six factors account for 71 percent of the variables studied. Schneider and Dachler (1978) indicated that the relative independence of the six JDI satisfaction scales over time has been established.

The qualitative data were evaluated using the constant comparative method of Lincoln and Guba (1985). This ten step method leads to the emergence of themes that summarize the information contained in the interviews.

The quantitative data were analyzed using multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA). The results of the analysis of the questionnaires were reported in detail in the Interim Evaluation Report of the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program (Whelan et al, 1991.)

Conclusions and Recommendations

These conclusions and recommendations are based on the results reported in the interim report and in the final report.

Conclusions

1. Generally, persons involved with MCOP: MCOP teachers, interns, teacher participants and principals, were pleased with the MCOP program and felt that the expressed goals were important and attainable as the program is designed. While the MCOP teachers were the most positive, the majority of all responses were positive. Principals in general and teacher participants in Option III were the least positive.

2. MCOP teachers expressed high satisfaction in their jobs in general and had positive impressions of both their co-workers and supervisors. Much networking among teachers resulted from participation in the MCOP program. On the other hand, according to the job description survey, they were dissatisfied with their present pay and their opportunity for promotion.

3. Some of the MCOP teachers felt that the amount of time required for the MCOP teacher to conduct the program was excessive, in some cases restricting other professionalresponsibilities or in many cases even personal or family responsibilities. Considerable stress is involved in some of the responsibilities, especially notable with some Option I teachers. This was generally attributed to LTIP/LaTEP. Also, some of theteachers and principals were very concerned about these superior teachers being away from their students too much.

4. Generally MCOP teachers felt that too many people were not adequately informed about the purpose of MCOP and its value to our educational system. Specifically, principals, faculty at local school sites, superintendents and other central office staff personnel, and the community at large are populations that need more information.

5. The involvement of teachers in extended day activities (Option II) with students resulted in the teachers' perception that there was a closer relationship with the student. That relationship was perceived to be a stimulant not only for improved student involvement and achievement but in a more committed effort on their own part for serving the students.

6. MCOP teachers generally felt that the master's degree and seven years experience should remain as a prerequisite to participating as an MCOP teacher. They expressed concern that many talented, superior teachers would not be able to share their skills but that perhaps alternative roles could be designed for them.

7. Teachers in Option III receive a budget for expenses incurred in the process of providing the staff development activities. Apparently teachers in the other options must take expenses from their salary. Option III teachers expressed a need for a more flexible, timely budget management process.

8. The MCOP program, when fully implemented, can result in a more unified effort on the part of faculty and staff and a more positive attitude at the school.

9. The attitude of the MCOP teachers toward their profession and their role in the profession is improved by MCOP. The fact that they are a key factor in helping to solve important problems and that they are personally able to determine solutions and implement them results in a feeling of value and importance especially when the feedback from their efforts is positive. A greater willingness to try new ideas was expressed.

10. The needs addressed by MCOP and the services provided are so great that the MCOP teachers felt the program should be expanded.

11. There is inadequate coordination between LTIP/LaTEP and Option I and III MCOP teachers. Better communications could result in more relevant and timely staff development activities and a better attitude toward the statewide teacher evaluation process.

12. The results of the log analysis indicated so much variance in response as to make them unreliable. This variance is attributed to the lack of specificity of the instrument and to the fact that many of the MCOP teachers did not fill them out conscientiously.

Recommendations

1. Prior to the implementation of the next cycle of MCOP, press releases should be provided for the communities served by MCOP. Faculties of newly involved schools should be oriented to the program. Personnel from successful MCOP programs might be utilized in this effort. Many of the teachers said that the public in general and teachers in particular were uninformed about the program.

2. Since principals are key to the sound implementation of the program, it is recommended that in-service education be specifically designed for principals and new MCOP teachers. The focus of the in-service should be aimed towards the intent of the MCOP program, guidelines for implementing programs and team building. At least some of the sessions should be with principals and teachers together and should be conducted in the summer in regional sites if possible.

3. Successful MCOP teachers and principals could be utilized in providing training though care should be taken in selecting them.

4. Resource materials should be developed which would help to provide guidelines for program implementation. These materials should be based (at least partially) on the experiences of previous participants in the MCOP program.

5. Budgets for materials and expenses should be provided so that MCOP pay is for salary for services rendered and not expenses incurred. Consideration should be given towards a fiscal management system that is flexible and timely yet manageable.

6. Much information regarding problems with the process involved in the implementation of LTIP/LaTEP lies imbedded in the teacher logs, especially in Option I. While it goes beyond the scope of this evaluation, it is recommended that the logs be carefully analyzed to identify those problems and use the results of that analysis to launch a comprehensive study of the process involved in implementing LTIP/LaTEP.

7. The roles of MCOP I and MCOP III appeared to be blurred such that in some cases MCOP III teachers were also acting as mentors or coach consultants. If the roles in Option I and III are

to be kept distinct, specific guidelines with regard to the MCOP III should be developed.

8. In certain cases with regard to Option One teachers felt it difficult to distinguish between the roles of mentor and coach consultant since they were performing both. It is recommended that teachers be allowed the flexibility to perform both as mentors and coach/consultants as necessary.

9. Daily logs should be continued, however, they should be in a form that is not only easier for the teacher but provides more complete and valid information. Based on the experience of the evaluators this year, it is possible to categorize the type of information and place it on a a scanner sheet for easier recording and processing. Comments, however, are probably more enlightening than the data.

10. A monitoring system should be devised which would insure that programs are being implemented as designed and that sufficient support is being provided.

11. The local program evaluation component of MCOP needs greater emphasis. Guidance should be provided prior to proposals so that teachers and principals are prepared to provide sound feedback about the adequacy of the program.

12. As the number of superior teachers grows and more than one MCOP teacher might serve a school, consideration should be given to either providing release time or rotating responsibilities so that teachers can organize their time for more efficient, less stressful service.

References

Bowling Green University. (1985). The job descriptive index. Bowling Green, OH: Author

Campbell, D. and Fiske, D. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, (2), 81-105.

Evans, M. (1969). Conceptual and operational problems in the measurement of various aspects of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, (2), 93-101.

Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA. Sage.

Schneider, B., and Daedler, H. (1978). A note on the stability of the job descriptive index. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, (5), 650-653.

Schulz, I. and Teddlie, C. (1989). The relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their perception of principals' use of power and school effectiveness. Education, 109, (4), 461-468.

Schulz, I., Teddlie, C. and Cleveland, R. (1989). principals' use of power: Implications for practice. Record in Educational Administration and Supervision, 9, (2), 36-38.

Smith, P., Smith, O. and Rollo, J. (1974). Factor structure for black and whites on the job descriptive index and its discrimination of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, (1), 99-100.

Whelan, C., Hoover, D. and Teddlie, C. (1991). Interim Evaluation Report for the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Department of Education, Bureau of Accountability.